arXiv:0805.1548v1 [math.LO] 11 May 2008

COMBINATORIAL AND MODEL-THEORETICAL PRINCIPLES RELATED TO REGULARITY OF ULTRAFILTERS AND COMPACTNESS OF TOPOLOGICAL SPACES. IV.

PAOLO LIPPARINI

Abstract. We extend to singular cardinals the model-theoretical relation $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$ introduced in [L3]. We extend some results obtained in Part II, finding equivalent conditions involving uniformity of ultrafilters and the existence of certain infinite matrices. Our present definition suggests a new compactness property for abstract logics.

See Parts I, II, III [L5] or [CN, CK, KM, BF, L1, L3, L4] for unexplained notation.

For λ, ν infinite cardinals, $S_\nu(\lambda)$ denotes the set of subsets of λ of cardinality $< \nu$. A set $X \subseteq S_\nu(\lambda)$ is *cofinal* in $S_\nu(\lambda)$ if and only if for every $x \in S_\nu(\lambda)$ there exists $y \in X$ such that $x \subseteq y$. The *cofinality* $\operatorname{cf} S_\nu(\lambda)$ of $S_\nu(\lambda)$ is the minimal cardinality of a cofinal subset of $S_\nu(\lambda)$. Notice that if λ is regular, then $\operatorname{cf} S_\lambda(\lambda) = \lambda$.

Remark 1. If $X \subseteq S_\lambda(\lambda)$ is cofinal in $S_\lambda(\lambda)$ then an ultrafilter D over λ is uniform if and only if $x \notin D$ for every $x \in X$, if and only if $\lambda \setminus x \in D$ for every $x \in X$.

We are now going to extend to singular cardinals the definition of $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$ as given in [L3] and recalled in Part II (see also [L1], [L4, Section 0]).

Definition 2. Suppose that $\lambda \geq \mu$ are infinite cardinals, and $\kappa \geq \sup\{\operatorname{cf} S_\lambda(\lambda), \operatorname{cf} S_\mu(\mu)\}$.

Fix some set $V \subseteq S_\lambda(\lambda)$ cofinal in $S_\lambda(\lambda)$ of cardinality $\leq \kappa$, and some set $W \subseteq S_\mu(\mu)$ cofinal in $S_\mu(\mu)$ of cardinality $\leq \kappa$. (Of course, it is

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 03C20, 03E05, 03C95 Secondary 03C55, 03C98.

Key words and phrases. Elementary extensions of cardinals with additional structure; infinite matrices; uniform, regular, decomposable ultrafilters; compactness properties of abstract logics.

The author has received support from MPI and GNSAGA. We wish to express our gratitude to X. Caicedo for stimulating discussions and correspondence.

always possible to choose V of cardinality $\operatorname{cf} S_\lambda(\lambda)$ and W of cardinality $\operatorname{cf} S_\mu(\mu)$.)

Consider the model $\mathfrak{A}' = \langle \lambda, R, R_v \rangle_{v \in V \cup W}$, where

(i) for $\gamma < \lambda$, $\mathfrak{A}' \models R(\gamma)$ if and only if $\gamma < \mu$, and

(ii) for $\gamma < \lambda$ and $v \in V \cup W$, $\mathfrak{A}' \models R_v(\gamma)$ if and only if $\gamma \in v$.

Now for the definition of the relation $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$.

The relation $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$ means that the model $\mathfrak{A}'$ has an expansion $\mathfrak{A}$ in a language with at most κ new symbols such that whenever $\mathfrak{B}$ is an elementary extension of $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ has an element x such that $\mathfrak{B} \models \neg R_v(x)$ for every $v \in V$, then $\mathfrak{B}$ has an element y such that $\mathfrak{B} \models R(y)$ and $\mathfrak{B} \models \neg R_w(y)$ for every $w \in W$.

Remark 3. Notice that the above definition is independent from the choice of the sets V and W. Indeed, suppose that $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$ holds relative to some given particular choice of V cofinal in $S_\lambda(\lambda)$ of cardinality $\leq \kappa$, and W cofinal in $S_\mu(\mu)$ of cardinality $\leq \kappa$. Notice that such a choice is always possible, since $\kappa \geq \sup\{\operatorname{cf} S_\lambda(\lambda), \operatorname{cf} S_\mu(\mu)\}$.

Consider another choice V^*, W^* of cofinal sets of cardinality $\leq \kappa$, and consider the model $\mathfrak{C}' = \langle \lambda, R, R_v \rangle_{v \in V^* \cup W^*}$ such that, as above, $\mathfrak{C}' \models R_v(\gamma)$ if and only if $\gamma \in v$.

Expand $\mathfrak{C}'$ to a model $\mathfrak{C}$ by adding (at most κ-many new) relations R_v ($v \in V \cup W$), plus all constants, functions and relations added to $\mathfrak{A}'$ in order to get some $\mathfrak{A}$ witnessing $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$ relative to the choice of V, W (notice that $\mathfrak{A}'$ and $\mathfrak{C}'$ have the same base set.)

Whenever $\mathfrak{D}$ is an elementary extension of $\mathfrak{C}$, then an appropriate reduct $\mathfrak{B}$ of $\mathfrak{D}$ is an elementary extension of $\mathfrak{A}$. It is now easy to show that if $\mathfrak{A}$ witnesses $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$ when the definition is given relative to V, W, then $\mathfrak{C}$ witnesses $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$ when the definition is given relative to V^*, W^* (since V and W are cofinal).

Thus, the definition of $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$ is independent from the choice of the pair of the cofinal sets, provided, of course, that they have cardinality $\leq \kappa$.

Remark 4. We are now going to show that, when $\kappa \geq \lambda \geq \mu$, and both λ and μ are regular cardinals, then the relation $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$ as defined here is equivalent to $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$ as defined in [L3, Definition 1.2] (assuming $\kappa \geq \lambda$ is no essential loss of generality since, in the sense of [L3, Definition 1.2], $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$ is equivalent to $\lambda \overset{\kappa'}{\Rightarrow} \mu$, when $\omega \leq \kappa, \kappa' \leq \lambda$).

First observe that if λ is regular, then $\operatorname{cf} S_\lambda(\lambda) = \lambda$, hence, if both λ and μ are regular, and $\lambda \geq \mu$, then the condition $\kappa \geq \sup\{\operatorname{cf} S_\lambda(\lambda),$ $\operatorname{cf} S_\mu(\mu)\}$ in Definition 2 becomes simply $\kappa \geq \lambda$.

Moreover, if λ is regular, then the set $V = \{[0, \delta] | \delta < \lambda\}$ is cofinal in $S_\lambda(\lambda)$; similarly, if μ is regular, then $W = \{[0, \alpha] | \alpha < \mu\}$ is cofinal in $S_\mu(\mu)$. Letting $\mathfrak{A}'$ be as in Definition 2 for the above choice of V and W, we have that if $v = [0, \delta]$ then $\neg R_v(\gamma)$ holds in $\mathfrak{A}'$ if and only if $\delta < \gamma$. Similarly, if $w \in W$, say, $w = [0, \varepsilon]$, then $R(\alpha) \wedge \neg R_w(\alpha)$ holds in $\mathfrak{A}'$ if and only if $\varepsilon < \alpha < \mu$.

Now notice that the definition of $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$ as given here involves an element x such that $\mathfrak{B} \models \neg R_v(x)$ for every $v \in V$, and an element y such that $\mathfrak{B} \models R(y)$ and $\mathfrak{B} \models \neg R_w(y)$ for every $w \in W$, while the definition of $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$ as given in [L3] (or in Part II) involves an element x such that $\mathfrak{B} \models \gamma < x$ for every $\gamma < \lambda$, and an element y such that $\mathfrak{B} \models \alpha < y < \mu$ for every $\alpha < \mu$.

Hence, the above comments show that, for the above particular choice of the sets V and W, and modulo appropriate expansions, the elements x and y are required to satisfy sentences which are equivalent. Hence the two definitions of $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$ are equivalent, since, as noticed in Remark 3, our present definition does not depend on the choice of the sets V and W.

Remark 5. On the contrary, for either λ or μ singular, the notion $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$ introduced in Definition 2 is **not** equivalent to the notion $(\lambda, \lambda) \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} (\mu, \mu)$ introduced in [L1] (see also [L4, Section 0]).

Indeed, $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$, as introduced here, involves analogues of λ-decomposability of ultrafilters, while $(\lambda, \lambda) \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} (\mu, \mu)$ involves analogues of (λ, λ)-regularity.

Actually, when $\kappa \geq \max\{2^\lambda, 2^\mu\}$, then $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$ is equivalent to "*every λ-decomposable ultrafilter is μ-decomposable*" (e. g. by Theorem 7), while $(\lambda, \lambda) \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} (\mu, \mu)$ is equivalent to "*every (λ, λ)-regular ultrafilter is (μ, μ)-regular*" ([L1, Proposition 1]). Cf. also [L3, Theorem 2.5].

These notions are distinct for singular cardinals, since, for example, every (λ^+, λ^+)-regular ultrafilter is (λ, λ)-regular, while if κ is strongly compact, there exists a $\kappa^{\omega+1}$-decomposable ultrafilter which is not κ^ω-decomposable.

However, it is not difficult to show that the two notions $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$ and $(\lambda, \lambda) \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} (\mu, \mu)$ coincide when both λ and μ are regular cardinals. When $\kappa \geq 2^\lambda$ this is obvious, since, for λ regular, an ultrafilter is λ-decomposable if and only if it is (λ, λ)-regular.

Remark 6. Let λ be an infinite cardinal, and let $V \subseteq S_\lambda(\lambda)$ be cofinal in $S_\lambda(\lambda)$. Let $\mathfrak{A}' = \langle \lambda, R_v \rangle_{v \in V}$, where the R_v's are as in Definition 2. It is easy to show that, an ultrafilter D is λ-decomposable if and only if in the model $\mathfrak{B} = \prod_D \mathfrak{A}'$ there is an element x such that $\mathfrak{B} \models \neg R_v(x)$ for every $v \in V$.

Theorem 7. *Suppose that $\lambda \geq \mu$ are infinite cardinals, and $\kappa \geq \sup\{\operatorname{cf} S_\lambda(\lambda), \operatorname{cf} S_\mu(\mu)\}$. Then the following conditions are equivalent.*

(a) $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$ holds.

(b) There are κ functions $(f_\beta)_{\beta\in\kappa}$ from λ to μ such that whenever D is an ultrafilter uniform over λ then there exists some $\beta \in \kappa$ such that $f_\beta(D)$ is uniform over μ.

(b′) There are κ functions $(f_\beta)_{\beta\in\kappa}$ from λ to μ such that for every function $g : \kappa \to S_\mu(\mu)$ there exists some finite set $F \subseteq \kappa$ such that $\left|\bigcap_{\beta\in F} f_\beta^{-1}(g(\beta))\right| < \lambda$.

(c) There is a family $(C_{\alpha,\beta})_{\alpha\in\mu,\beta\in\kappa}$ of subsets of λ such that:
(i) For every $\beta \in \kappa$, $(C_{\alpha,\beta})_{\alpha\in\mu}$ is a partition of λ.
(ii) For every function $g : \kappa \to S_\mu(\mu)$ there exists a finite subset $F \subseteq \kappa$ such that $|\bigcap_{\beta\in F} \bigcup_{\alpha\in g(\beta)} C_{\alpha,\beta}| < \lambda$.

Proof. Let us fix $V \subseteq S_\lambda(\lambda)$ cofinal in $S_\lambda(\lambda)$ of cardinality $\leq \kappa$, and $W \subseteq S_\mu(\mu)$ cofinal in $S_\mu(\mu)$ of cardinality $\leq \kappa$. Such sets V and W exist by the assumption $\kappa \geq \sup\{\operatorname{cf} S_\lambda(\lambda), \operatorname{cf} S_\mu(\mu)\}$.

Notice that, as we proved in Remark 3 , the definition of $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$ is independent from the choice of the sets V and W.

(a) ⇒ (b). Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be an expansion of $\langle \lambda, R, R_v\rangle_{v\in V\cup W}$ witnessing $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$.

Without loss of generality (since $\kappa \geq \lambda$) we can assume that each element of A is represented by some constant symbol, and that $\mathfrak{A}$ has Skolem functions (see [CK, Section 3.3]). Indeed, since $\kappa \geq |V \cup W|$, adding Skolem functions to $\mathfrak{A}$ involves adding at most κ new symbols.

Consider the set of all functions $f : \lambda \to \mu$ which are definable in $\mathfrak{A}$. Enumerate them as $(f_\beta)_{\beta\in\kappa}$. We are going to show that these functions witness (b).

Indeed, let D be an ultrafilter uniform over λ. Consider the D-class Id_D of the identity function on λ. Since D is uniform over λ, letting $\mathfrak{C} = \prod_D \mathfrak{A}$ we have that $\mathfrak{C} \models \neg R_v(Id_D)$ for every $v \in V$ (since $|v| \leq \lambda$, for $v \in V$).

Let $\mathfrak{B}$ be the Skolem hull of Id_D in $\mathfrak{C}$. By Łoš Theorem, $\mathfrak{C} \equiv \mathfrak{A}$. Since $\mathfrak{A}$ has Skolem functions, hence $\mathfrak{C}$ has Skolem functions, then $\mathfrak{B} \equiv \mathfrak{C}$, by [CK, Proposition 3.3.2]. By transitivity, $\mathfrak{B} \equiv \mathfrak{A}$. Since $\mathfrak{A}$ has a name for each element of A, then $\mathfrak{B}$ is an elementary extension of $\mathfrak{A}$.

Since $\mathfrak{A}$ witnesses $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$, and since $\mathfrak{B} \models \neg R_v(Id_D)$ for every $v \in V$ then $\mathfrak{B}$ has an element y_D such that $\mathfrak{B} \models R(y_D)$ and $\mathfrak{B} \models \neg R_w(y_D)$ for every $w \in W$.

Since $\mathfrak{B}$ is the Skolem hull of Id_D in $\mathfrak{C}$, we have $y_D = f(Id_D)$, that is, $y_D = f_D$, for some function $f : \lambda \to A = \lambda$ definable in $\mathfrak{A}$. Since f is definable, then also the following function f' is definable:

$$f'(\gamma) = \begin{cases} f(\gamma) & \text{if } f(\gamma) < \mu \\ 0 & \text{if } f(\gamma) \geq \mu \end{cases}$$

Since $\mathfrak{B} \models R(y_D)$, then $\{\gamma < \lambda | \mathfrak{A} \models R(y(\gamma))\} \in D$, that is, $\{\gamma < \lambda | y(\gamma) < \mu\} \in D$. Since $y_D = f_D$, $\{\gamma < \lambda | y(\gamma) = f(\gamma)\} \in D$. Hence, $\{\gamma < \lambda | y(\gamma) = f'(\gamma)\} \in D$, since it contains the intersection of two sets in D. Thus, $y_D = f'_D$.

Since $f' : \lambda \to \mu$ and f' is definable in $\mathfrak{A}$, then $f = f_\beta$ for some $\beta \in \kappa$, thus $y_D = (f_\beta)_D$.

We need to show that $D' = f_\beta(D)$ is uniform over μ. Indeed, suppose that $z \in S_\mu(\mu)$. We have to show that $z \notin f_\beta(D)$.

Since W is supposed to be cofinal in $S_\mu(\mu)$, there is $w \in W$ such that $z \subseteq w$. Since $\mathfrak{B} \models \neg R_w(y_D)$, then $\{\gamma < \lambda | \mathfrak{A} \models \neg R_w(y(\gamma))\} \in D$; that is, $\{\gamma < \lambda | \mathfrak{A} \models \neg R_w(f_\beta(\gamma))\} \in D$, that is, $\{\gamma < \lambda | f_\beta(\gamma) \notin w\} \in D$, that is, $\{\alpha < \mu | \alpha \notin w\} \in f_\beta(D)$, that is, $w \notin f_\beta(D)$. Since $z \subseteq w$, then $z \notin D' = f_\beta(D)$.

We have showed that no element of $S_\mu(\mu)$ belongs to D' and this means that D' is uniform over μ.

(b) $\Rightarrow$ (a). Suppose we have functions $(f_\beta)_{\beta\in\kappa}$ as given by (b).

Expand $\langle \lambda, R, R_v \rangle_{v \in V \cup W}$ to a model $\mathfrak{A}$ by adding, for each $\beta \in \kappa$, a new function symbol representing f_β (by abuse of notation, in what follows we shall write f_β both for the function itself and for the symbol that represents it).

Suppose that $\mathfrak{B}$ is an elementary extension of $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ has an element x such that $\mathfrak{B} \models \neg R_v(x)$ for every $v \in V$.

For every formula $\varphi(z)$ with just one variable z in the language of $\mathfrak{A}$ let $E_\varphi = \{\gamma < \lambda | \mathfrak{A} \models \varphi(\gamma)\}$. Let $F = \{E_\varphi | \mathfrak{B} \models \varphi(x)\}$. Since the intersection of any two members of F is still in F, and $\emptyset \notin F$ (since $\mathfrak{A} \equiv \mathfrak{B}$ and since if $\mathfrak{B} \models \phi(x)$ then $\mathfrak{B} \models \exists z \phi(z)$), then F can be extended to an ultrafilter D on λ.

For every $v \in V$, consider the formula $\varphi(z) \equiv \neg R_v(z)$. We get $E_\varphi = \{\gamma < \lambda | \mathfrak{A} \models \neg R_v(\gamma)\} = \lambda \setminus v$. On the other side, since $\mathfrak{B} \models \neg R_v(x)$, then by the definition of F we have $E_\varphi = \lambda \setminus v \in F \subseteq D$. Thus, by Remark 1, and since V is cofinal in $S_\lambda(\lambda)$, D is uniform over λ.

By (b), $f_\beta(D)$ is uniform over μ, for some $\beta \in \kappa$. Thus, $\mu \backslash w \in f_\beta(D)$, for every $w \in W$. That is, $\{\gamma < \lambda | \mathfrak{A} \models \neg R_w(f_\beta(\gamma))\} \in D$ for every $w \in W$.

For every $w \in W$, consider the formula $\psi(z) \equiv \neg R_w(f_\beta(z))$. By the previous sentence, $E_\psi \in D$. Notice that $E_{\neg\psi}$ is the complement of E_ψ in λ. Since D is proper, and $E_\psi \in D$, then $E_{\neg\psi} \notin D$. Since D extends F, and either $E_\psi \in F$ or $E_{\neg\psi} \in F$, we necessarily have $E_\psi \in F$, that is, $\mathfrak{B} \models \psi(x)$, that is, $\mathfrak{B} \models \neg R_w(f_\beta(x))$.

Since $w \in W$ has been chosen arbitrarily, we have that $\mathfrak{B} \models \neg R_w(f_\beta(x))$ for every $w \in W$. Moreover, since $f_\beta : \lambda \to \mu$, then $\mathfrak{A} \models \forall z R(f_\beta(z))$, hence, since $\mathfrak{B} \equiv \mathfrak{A}$, then $\mathfrak{B} \models R(f_\beta(x))$.

Thus, we have proved that $\mathfrak{B}$ has an element $y = f_\beta(x)$ such that $\mathfrak{B} \models R(y)$ and $\mathfrak{B} \models \neg R_w(y)$ for every $w \in W$.

(b) $\Leftrightarrow$ (b$'$) follows from Lemma 9 below.

(b$'$) $\Rightarrow$ (c). Suppose that we have functions $(f_\beta)_{\beta\in\kappa}$ as given by (b$'$). For $\alpha \in \mu$ and $\beta \in \kappa$, define $C_{\alpha,\beta} = f_\beta^{-1}(\{\alpha\})$.

The family $(C_{\alpha,\beta})_{\alpha\in\mu,\beta\in\kappa}$ trivially satisfies Condition (i). Moreover, Condition (ii) is clearly equivalent to the condition imposed on the f_β's in (b$'$).

(c) $\Rightarrow$ (b$'$). Suppose we are given the family $(C_{\alpha,\beta})_{\alpha\in\mu,\beta\in\kappa}$ from (c). For $\beta \in \kappa$ and $\gamma < \lambda$, define $f_\beta(\gamma)$ to be the unique (by (i)) $\alpha \in \mu$ such that $\gamma \in C_{\alpha,\beta}$. Then $f_\beta^{-1}(g(\beta)) = \bigcup_{\alpha\in g(\beta)} C_{\alpha,\beta}$, thus Condition (ii) in (c) implies that (b$'$) holds. □

Corollary 8. *If $\lambda \geq \mu$ and $\kappa \geq 2^\lambda$, then $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$, if and only if every ultrafilter uniform over λ is μ-decomposable.*

Thus, if $\kappa, \kappa' \geq 2^\lambda$, then $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$ if and only if $\lambda \overset{\kappa'}{\Rightarrow} \mu$.

Lemma 9. *Suppose that $\lambda \geq \mu$ are infinite regular cardinals, and κ is a cardinal. Suppose that $(f_\beta)_{\beta\in\kappa}$ is a given set of functions from λ to μ. Then the following are equivalent.*

(a) Whenever D is an ultrafilter uniform over λ then there exists some $\beta \in \kappa$ such that $f_\beta(D)$ is uniform over μ.

(b) For every function $g : \kappa \to S_\mu(\mu)$ there exists some finite set $F \subseteq \kappa$ such that $\left|\bigcap_{\beta\in F} f_\beta^{-1}(g(\beta))\right| < \lambda$.

Proof. We show that the negation of (a) is equivalent to the negation of (b).

Indeed, (a) is false if and only if there exists an ultrafilter D uniform over λ such that for every $\beta \in \kappa$ it happens that $f_\beta(D)$ is not uniform over μ. This means that for every $\beta \in \kappa$ there exists some $g(\beta) \in S_\mu(\mu)$ such that $g(\beta) \in f_\beta(D)$, that is, $f_\beta^{-1}(g(\beta)) \in D$.

Thus, there exists some D which makes (a) false if and only if there exists some function $g : \kappa \to S_\mu(\mu)$ such that the set $\{f_\beta^{-1}(g(\beta)) | \beta \in \kappa\} \cup \{x \subseteq \lambda | |\lambda \setminus x| < \lambda\}$ has the finite intersection property.

Equivalently, there exists some function $g : \kappa \to S_\mu(\mu)$ such that for every finite $F \subseteq \kappa$ the cardinality of $\bigcap_{\beta \in F} f_\beta^{-1}(g(\beta))$ is equal to λ.

This is exactly the negation of (b). $\square$

Definition 2 suggests the introduction of the following compactness property for logics.

Definition 10. Suppose that λ is an infinite cardinal, and $\kappa \geq \operatorname{cf} S_\lambda(\lambda)$.

Fix some set $V \subseteq S_\lambda(\lambda)$ cofinal in $S_\lambda(\lambda)$ of cardinality $\leq \kappa$.

If $(\varphi_v)_{v \in V}$ are sentences of some logic, and $\gamma \in \lambda$, let $T_\gamma = \{\varphi_v | v \in V, \gamma \notin v\}$ and $T = \{\varphi_v | v \in V\}$.

We say that a logic $\mathcal{L}$ is κ-(λ)-*compact* if and only if the following holds.

Whenever Σ is a set of sentences of $\mathcal{L}$, $|\Sigma| \leq \kappa$, $(\varphi_v)_{v \in V}$ are sentences of $\mathcal{L}$ and

$$\Sigma \cup T_\gamma \text{ has a model for every } \gamma \in \lambda,$$

then

$$\Sigma \cup T \text{ has a model.}$$

When the restriction $|\Sigma| \leq \kappa$ on Σ is dropped, we say that $\mathcal{L}$ is $[\lambda]$-*compact*. That is, $[\lambda]$-compactness is ∞-(λ)-compactness. (Notice: for λ singular, this is a **distinct** notion from $[\lambda]$-compactness as defined in [Ma]. However, the two notions coincide for λ regular, see Proposition 14).

Remark 11. Since κ is supposed to be $\geq \operatorname{cf} S_\lambda(\lambda)$, the above definition is independent from the choice of the set $V \subseteq S_\lambda(\lambda)$.

Indeed, suppose that the logic $\mathcal{L}$ is κ-(λ)-compact when the definition is given relative to the cofinal set V, and let V^* be cofinal in $S_\lambda(\lambda)$ with $|V^*| \leq \kappa$.

Let $(\varphi^*_w)_{w \in V^*}$ and Σ^* be sentences of $\mathcal{L}$, with $|\Sigma^*| \leq \kappa$, and let $T^*_\gamma = \{\varphi^*_w | w \in V^*, \gamma \notin w\}$ and $T^* = \{\varphi^*_w | w \in V^*\}$. Assuming that $\Sigma^* \cup T^*_\gamma$ has a model $\mathfrak{A}_\gamma$, whenever $\gamma \in \lambda$, we want to show that $\Sigma^* \cup T^*$ has a model.

For each $v \in V$ let us consider a new sentence φ_v. The actual form of φ_v does not matter, we shall simply use φ_v as a truth value which should be independent from all the sentences $(\varphi^*_w)_{w \in V^*}$ and from all sentences of Σ^*. For example, add a new constant symbol c and new relation symbols $(R_v)_{v \in V}$, and let $\varphi_v \equiv R_v(c)$. Alternatively, let $\varphi_v \equiv \exists x R_v(x)$.

Let $\Sigma = \Sigma^* \cup \{\varphi_v \Rightarrow \varphi^*_w | v \in V, w \in V^*, v \supseteq w\}$. Clearly, $|\Sigma| \leq \kappa$. As before, let $T_\gamma = \{\varphi_v | v \in V, \gamma \notin v\}$.

It is easy to show that $\Sigma \cup T_\gamma$ has a model for every $\gamma \in \lambda$: just expand the model $\mathfrak{A}_\gamma$ in such a way that φ_v holds true just in case $\gamma \notin v$.

By κ-(λ)-compactness as given by the definition relative to the cofinal set V, we get that $\Sigma \cup T$ has a model, where $T = \{\varphi_v | v \in V\}$. Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be a model of $\Sigma \cup T$. $\mathfrak{A}$ is also a model of Σ^*, since $\Sigma \supseteq \Sigma^*$. Moreover, for every $w \in V^*$ there exists $v \in V$ such that $v \supseteq w$, since V is cofinal in $S_\lambda(\lambda)$. Since φ_v holds in $\mathfrak{A}$, and $\varphi_v \Rightarrow \varphi^*_w$ is in Σ, then φ^*_w holds in $\mathfrak{A}$. Thus $\mathfrak{A}$ is a model of $\Sigma^* \cup T^*$.

We have showed that the logic $\mathcal{L}$ is κ-(λ)-compact with reference to the definition given with respect to the cofinal set V^*.

Remark 12. Suppose, as in Definition 10, that λ is an infinite cardinal, $\kappa \geq \operatorname{cf} S_\lambda(\lambda)$, $V \subseteq S_\lambda(\lambda)$ is cofinal in $S_\lambda(\lambda)$ and $|V| \leq \kappa$.

If $(\Gamma_v)_{v \in V}$ are sets of sentences of some logic $\mathcal{L}$, and $\gamma \in \lambda$, let $U_\gamma = \bigcup \{\Gamma_v | v \in V, \gamma \notin v\}$ and $U = \bigcup_{v \in V} \Gamma_v$.

Arguments similar to the ones in Remark 11 (cf. also [Ma, proof of Proposition 1.1.1]) show that a logic $\mathcal{L}$ is κ-(λ)-compact if and only if the following holds.

Whenever $(\Gamma_v)_{v \in V}$ are sets of sentences of $\mathcal{L}$, and $|\Gamma_v| \leq \kappa$ for every $v \in V$, if U_γ has a model for every $\gamma \in \lambda$, then U has a model.

Proposition 13. *If $\kappa \geq \operatorname{cf} S_\lambda(\lambda)$, then every κ-(λ)-compact logic is κ-$(\operatorname{cf} \lambda)$-compact.*

Recall the definition of κ-(λ, λ)-compactness from [L1] or [L3, Proposition 2.1]. Cf. also [L4, Section 1]. Recall the definition of $[\mu, \lambda]$-compactness from [Ma, Definition 1.1.3].

Proposition 14. *If λ is an infinite regular cardinal, and $\kappa \geq \lambda$, then a logic is κ-(λ)-compact if and only if it is κ-(λ, λ)-compact.*

If λ is an infinite regular cardinal, then a logic is $[\lambda]$-compact if and only if it is $[\lambda, \lambda]$-compact.

Notice that in Remarks 11 and 12, and in Propositions 13 and 14 we need really few regularity properties for $\mathcal{L}$. In contrast, the proofs of the next propositions make heavy use of relativization. See [E] for the definition of a regular logic. In the next propositions slightly less is needed: instead of requiring a logic $\mathcal{L}$ to be regular, it is enough to require that $\mathcal{L}$ satisfies the properties listed in [L2, Section 1].

Proposition 15. *Suppose that $\lambda \geq \mu$ are infinite cardinals, and $\kappa \geq \sup\{\operatorname{cf} S_\lambda(\lambda), \operatorname{cf} S_\mu(\mu)\}$.*

If $\lambda \overset{\kappa}{\Rightarrow} \mu$ holds, then every κ-(λ)-compact regular logic is κ-(μ)-compact.

If every ultrafilter uniform over λ *is* μ*-decomposable, then every* $[\lambda]$*-compact regular logic is* $[\mu]$*-compact.*

Proof. Similar to the proof of [L3, Theorem 2.4]. Cf. also [L1, Proposition 1]. For the last statement, use Corollary 8. □

Recall from [L2, p.440] the definition a limit ultrafilter. We say that a limit ultrafilter (D, V) (where D is over I) is λ-*decomposable* if and only if there exists a function $f : I \to \lambda$ such that $\{(i, j) | f(i) = f(j)\} \in V$ and for every $v \subseteq \lambda$ with $|v| < \lambda$ we have $f^{-1}(v) \notin D$.

Recall from [L2, Definition 2.4] the definition of the family $\mathbf{F}(\mathcal{L})$ associated to a logic $\mathcal{L}$.

Proposition 16. *If* $\mathcal{L}$ *is a regular logic, then the following are equivalent.*

(a) $\mathcal{L}$ *is* $[\lambda]$*-compact.*

(b) For every relativized (that is, many sorted) expansion $\mathfrak{A}$ *of the model* $\mathfrak{A}'$ *introduced in Definition 2, there exist an* $\mathcal{L}$*-elementary extension* $\mathfrak{B}$ *of* $\mathfrak{A}$ *and an element* $x \in B$ *such that* $\mathfrak{B} \models \neg R_v(x)$ *for every* $v \in V$ *(the choice of the set* V *cofinal in* $S_\lambda(\lambda)$ *is not relevant.)*

(c) For every infinite cardinal ν *there exists some* λ*-decomposable limit ultrafilter* (D, V) *such that* $(D, V, \nu) \in \mathbf{F}(\mathcal{L})$.

Proof. Similar to the proof of [L2, Theorem 2.3], using Remark 6. □

REFERENCES

[BF] J. Barwise, S. Feferman (editors), *Model-theoretic logics.* Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1985.

[C1] X. Caicedo, *On productive* $[\kappa, \lambda]$*-compactness, or the Abstract Compactness Theorem revisited*, manuscript (1995).

[C2] X. Caicedo, *The Abstract Compactness Theorem Revisited*, in *Logic and Foundations of Mathematics (A. Cantini et al. editors),* Kluwer Academic Publishers (1999), 131–141.

[CK] C. C. Chang and J. Keisler, Model Theory, Amsterdam (1977).

[CN] W. Comfort, S. Negrepontis, *The Theory of Ultrafilters*, Berlin (1974).

[E] H.-D. Ebbinghaus, *Extended logics: the general framework*, Chapter II in [BF], pp. 25–76.

[KM] A. Kanamori and M. Magidor, The evolution of large cardinal axioms in Set Theory, in: Higher Set Theory, edited by G. H. Müller and D. S. Scott, 99–275, Berlin (1978).

[KV] K. Kunen and J. E. Vaughan (editors), *Handbook of Set Theoretical Topology*, Amsterdam (1984).

[L1] P. Lipparini, *About some generalizations of* (λ, μ)*-compactness*, Proceedings of the 5th Easter conference on model theory (Wendisch Rietz, 1985), Seminarber., Humboldt-Univ. Berlin, Sekt. Math. **93**, 139–141 (1987). Available also at the author's web page.

[L2] P. Lipparini, *Limit ultrapowers and abstract logics*, J. Symbolic Logic **52** (1987), no. 2, 437–454.

[L3] P. Lipparini, *The compactness spectrum of abstract logics, large cardinals and combinatorial principles*, Boll. Unione Matematica Italiana ser. VII, **4-B** 875–903 (1990).

[L4] P. Lipparini, *Ultrafilter translations, I:* (λ, λ)*-compactness of logics with a cardinality quantifier*, Arch. Math. Logic **35**, 63–87 (1996).

[L5] P. Lipparini, *Combinatorial and model-theoretical principles related to regularity of ultrafilters and compactness of topological spaces. I*, arXiv:0803.3498; *II.*:0804.1445; *III.*:0804.3737 (2008).

[Ma] J. A. Makowsky, *Compactness, embeddings and definability*, Chapter XVIII in [BF], pp. 645–716.

Dipartimento di Matematica, Viale della Ricerca Scientifica, II Uniservitaccia di Roma (Tor Vergata), I-00133 ROME ITALY
URL: `http://www.mat.uniroma2.it/~lipparin`